



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/307,295	05/07/99	WILDE	901033-1001

DANIEL F PEREZ
GARDERE & WYNNE LLP
3000 THANKSGIVING TOWER
1601 ELM STREET
DALLAS TX 75201-4762

PM92/0616

EXAMINER

LEE, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

DATE MAILED: 06/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/307,295

Applicant(s)
Wilde et al.

Examiner
Jong-Suk (James) Lee

Group Art Unit
3673



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jong-Suk (James) Lee (3) _____

(2) Mr. John Montgomery (Reg. No. 31,124) (4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 13, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 30 and 35

Identification of prior art discussed:

Corley (US 1,295,008)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's attorney explained the distinctiveness of the invention over the prior art discussed is that the buoy having an (a plurality of) auxiliary buoyant member(s) removably mountable on the frame to selectively change the buoyancy of the buoy. However, examiner respectfully disagreed by mentioning that the recitation for the selectively removably mountable buoyant members to the frame does not define over the corley reference insofar as it is not clarified whether the buoy has a variety of buoyancy while it is being utilized on site/ in operation, or being manufactured. Applicant notified to file formal amendment by clarifying the discussed issue.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

EILEEN D. LILLIS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.